

Revisiting
The Revolt of the Black Athlete:
Harry Edwards
and the Making of the
New African-American
Sport Studies

MICHAEL E. LOMAX

Department of Physical Education and Sport Studies
University of Georgia

HARRY EDWARDS WAS A POLITICAL ACTIVIST in an era commonly referred to as the Black Power movement and a pioneer in the study of the African-American sporting experience. He was the first scholar to write a book about the black protest of the 1968 Olympic Games, and, until recently, his book, *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*, was the most definitive account of the period. Edwards' book went beyond the classical works of Edwin B. Henderson and Andrew S. ("Doc") Young, who focused essentially on African Americans' contribution to sport. They further argued that the integration of professional and collegiate sports represented African Americans' "halcyon days." The *New York Times* book review stated that no one who reads this book would ever again find comfort in the assumption that the "American sports establishment [was] a citadel of fair play and racial harmony." However, the *Times* added, somewhat inaccurately, that Edwards fell short in providing answers regarding the events leading up to the protest gestures by a handful of black athletes on the victory stand in Mexico City.¹

Edwards typified the Black Power activist who emerged in the late 1960s. He was a product of a broken home; by today's standards Edwards would be characterized as an at-risk youngster. Growing up on the mean streets of East St. Louis, Illinois, young Harry relied upon the initial necessary impetus from his father, Harry Sr., in order to participate in sports. The elder Edwards had trained to be a boxer, utilizing Joe Louis as a model of how sports could serve as a vehicle for social and economic uplift. Unlike his father, however, Edwards questioned the bogus sense of equality the champion was coerced into symbolizing. He reflected that Louis "had knocked out the German boxer Max Schmeling, providing unequivocal 'proof' that . . . Jim Crow segregation was superior to Hitler's dream society based upon the ideology of Aryan supremacy." More important, Edwards' attitude toward organized sports was ambivalent. He found them to be "too demanding in terms of time, too confusing in terms of my priorities then; and utterly unrewarding relative to the physical and personal sacrifices necessary to be a member" of the junior high school football team.²

Interestingly enough, organized sports provided Edwards the opportunity to pursue a college education. Upon his graduation from high school, Edwards moved to Fresno, California, to live with his grandmother and attend the local junior college there. At Fresno City College, Edwards developed an insatiable appetite for knowledge. He accumulated a B-plus grade average, and this, combined with his outstanding performance as a track and field athlete, resulted in his being awarded a scholarship to attend San Jose State College in the fall of 1960. Edwards earned a degree in sociology at San Jose State and received a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship to be applied toward graduate study at any university in the United States or Canada. He chose Cornell University because the its sociology department enjoyed an excellent reputation for its research on race relations and social stratification.

It was at Cornell that Edwards became more concerned with the overall progress of the African-American struggle for racial equality. As he explained in his autobiography, a new militancy emerged that was "both fostered and fed by growing concerns, particularly among young blacks, that the gradualism of the established civil rights methods and leadership was too slow." These concerns led Edwards to confront his own political responsibilities and resulted in him making periodic weekend trips to New York City to Malcolm X's Muslim mosque. According to Edwards, Malcolm's new and stimulating ideas stirred a passion in him to legitimize and act upon deeply felt convictions. Malcolm X's impassioned rhetoric was "street smart," and it had an almost visceral appeal to a young, black, economically distressed constituency. He constantly urged this constituency to question the validity of their "school book-and-media-inspired faith" in an integrated American Dream. Edwards was one of many who responded. Malcolm X's effort to convince blacks to reevaluate themselves was also appealing to Edwards. He spoke for the need for black unity and self-determination, for community control, and for the internalization of the black struggle. Edwards' travel to New York served as a political and cultural awakening, and he did not realize how influential Malcolm was upon his life until after the latter's assassination. When Edwards completed his master's degree at Cornell, he accepted a position as a part-time instructor at San Jose State College. Upon his return to San Jose State, Edwards acted upon his deeply felt convictions.³

Edwards' volume emerged at a time when several African-American athletes wrote autobiographies that broke from the traditional "aw nuts win-some-lose-some" popular culture genre. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, a young fan like me could learn about the black rage that permeated the African-American experience in sport. Several African-American athletes like Bill Russell, Johnny Sample, and Curt Flood wrote autobiographies that illustrated a heightened race consciousness as they broached controversial topics, such as race relations, and provided critical critiques of both professional and amateur sport institutions. They also discussed the inequitable conditions they confronted in the integrated sports world and how they responded to them. If one picked up a book on African-American history, there would have been either no mention of the African-American experience in sport or only a scant reference of Jackie Robinson crossing the color line in Organized Baseball.⁴

Unlike the autobiographies written by ghostwriters, Edwards had a formidable task to create his own analytical framework for the black athlete revolt, including the chronology and the critical issues. Edwards argued that the black athlete revolt sprang from the same seed that ignited the sit-ins, the freedom rides and the rebellions in Watts, Detroit, and Newark. He analyzed this most recent phase of the black liberation movement that defined the goals that served as the foundation for the athletes' protests and provided clarification for what had been portrayed as "the substantially elusive and irrational tactics and direction of their efforts." Black athletes were not speaking out only on their behalf but also in support of their downtrodden race.⁵

In chapter one of *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*, Edwards raised three fundamental questions that under girds his entire project and thought. He initially posed: "What has integration really meant to the black athlete? What has this move really meant psychologically, socially, and educationally for him? Is the Afro-American athlete significantly better off in predominantly white schools than he was in all-black institutions?" Edwards asserted that black athletes had not fared better at white institutions than at black colleges and universities because of their inability to engage in the coursework. To the contrary, the fundamental problem black athletes confronted stemmed from the "Mickey Mouse" courses they were channeled into by coaching staffs that often counseled them in academic matters. Lofty academic goals could possibly jeopardize a black athlete's college career, resulting in colleges losing their financial investment in him. Moreover, since a white coach rarely encountered a black doctor, sociologist, or dentist, African Americans must not possess the intellectual tools to reach such heights. Why, therefore, subject the "boy" to additional pressures? Why add any additional strain to his load? Black athletes were advised to take menial courses in "basket-weaving, car-washing, or gymnasium maintenance" to maintain their eligibility. If they failed to make it in the professional ranks once their college career was over, black athletes would return to the ghetto and resume the life of drudgery and humiliation that they knew before they went to college.⁶

Integrated teams resulted in black athletes finding themselves in a new, but oftentimes dehumanizing, educational and athletic environments. Understandably, black athletes approached this new life experience on a predominantly white campus with excitement but also with a large degree of uncertainty. They were somewhat unsure of their abilities

socially, athletically, educationally, and otherwise. They were overwhelmed by this new experience during their first few weeks on campus, and they undoubtedly questioned their athletic potential. What lies beneath their threatened pride was the possible reality that a black athlete chose a school at which "he is doomed to 'ride the pines' for four solid years."⁷

Vast areas of college life were off limits to black athletes. Among them were fraternities and sororities. Undoubtedly, much of this perspective was drawn from Edwards' athletic experience at San Jose State College. He points out how "puzzled and enraged I became when white teammates of mine . . . after avoiding me all week and closing their fraternity doors in my face, still could have the unmitigated nerve to talk to me about 'team spirit' on Saturday." Edwards added: "I soon found out, as do most black athletes at white schools, that white 'teammates' can practice with you five days a week for hours on and yet at night refer to you as 'coon' and 'jiggaboo' and then jump all over you on Saturday afternoons talking about team spirit."⁸

Interracial dating for black athletes was strictly taboo. According to Edwards, this edict was decreed by white coaches and enforced by white teammates, who often reported any incidents of interracial dating to their superiors. White females were ostracized by white team members who dated African Americans. If any white female even talked to a black male, much less dated him, she was stereotypically characterized as engaging in a lewd and licentious affair, or obsessed with a black man's assumed sexual prowess.⁹

In addition to enduring these imposed social and educational mores, black athletes confronted the common practice of "stacking" on white college campuses. Black players were channeled into one position or another to limit their numbers on the team. Edwards characterized this practice as a *de facto* quota system. Big name schools offered scholarships to only the top black athletes so theoretically black athletes could man the majority of all the positions on the team. Therefore in response, black players were stacked at a particular position—like halfback or end in football, or center or guard in basketball—and were left to compete among themselves for positions on the team opened to them. This resulted in a few blacks making the team at starting positions. Other black athletes with exceptional ability were summarily dismissed, or they could remain on the team if they agree to a cut in their financial support or consent to relinquish it all together.¹⁰

If African-American athletes were subjected to this constricted environment then why did they stay? Edwards pointed to two fundamental reasons. The heavy stigma the black community placed on failing constituted the first factor. If black athletes failed academically, they were ridiculed; if they quit, they were despised. They had not taken advantage of the opportunity that their parents did not have, and they failed those who had faith in them. More important, a black athlete who failed added validity to the supposition whites held that African Americans were lazy, ignorant, and will quit when the going gets tough. Black athletes' need to perform at a high caliber on the field represented the final factor. Undoubtedly, this reason spurred black athletes of the era, like Tommie Smith, Lew Alcindor, and O. J. Simpson, to perform at exceptional levels in their respective sports. But as Edwards pointed out their phenomenal performances would never result in them "proving themselves" in the eyes of white racists. From a

white racist perspective black athletes would always be "niggers." As Edwards sarcastically remarked "the only difference between the black man shining shoes in the ghetto and the champion black sprinter is that the shoe shine man is a nigger, while the sprinter is a fast nigger."¹¹

Edwards also critically assessed the professional team sports industry. Black professional athletes were a cog in the machine that was discarded once its production diminished. He compared them to the slaves in the cotton fields, who accommodated themselves to the discrimination and racism they encountered. Such behavior resulted in white racists actually believing that black athletes were not humiliated or enraged by the treatment they endured. Northern and southern whites envisioned for years that black professional athletes were genetically predisposed to being harmless, adhering to the Christian ethic of turning the other cheek. Black men engaging in violent, aggressive, competitive sports were regarded as "hereditarily non-violent." They were expected to be submissive and grateful to be on the field and, more important, fortunate to be paid for their efforts.

However, by the late 1960s Edwards declared that black professional athletes' attitudes were changing. They were less willing to accommodate and subordinate themselves, but they were still not completely free to respond as men. Cleveland Browns lineman John Wooten, for example, responded angrily and publicly to a social event staged by a white teammate who excluded blacks from attending. Wooten characterized this episode as racist and detrimental to team unity. The white player's response to Wooten was that he was overly sensitive and a troublemaker. Both players were promptly dismissed from the team. Whereas another NFL team picked up the white player, no such offer was forthcoming to Wooten. A NFL team did eventually pick up Wooten when the Olympic Committee for Human Rights held a press conference and threatened to disrupt any Cleveland Browns home game until he was "reinstated, at full salary, in professional football."¹²

Edwards focused on external agencies—like the mass media—that had a symbiotic relationship with both the college and professional team sports industries. Essentially, the mass media attempted to strike a happy medium between service and profit. Major social injustices in the athletic arena, therefore, were marginalized to minimize embarrassment to the sports establishment or were simply ignored. Major breakthroughs, like Jackie Robinson crossing the color line in Organized Baseball, were portrayed as a bastion of racial harmony and purity. Sports journalists and individuals who controlled the mass media promoted this distorted image to an unsuspecting public. In essence, the sports world reeked of the same racism that corrupted other areas of society.

Edwards divided sports journalists into two categories: reporters who maintain a "respectable Negro image," and the black sports reporter. Journalists who seek to sustain the respectable Negro image portrayed black people who attempted to emulate whites. They filled their pages with superficial stories like highlighting the latest fashions, or extolling the experiences of "the only Negro airline pilot," or the first black Major League Baseball umpire. When it came to relevant social, political, or economic issues, however, they took a middle-of-the-road stance. Rarely did they tackle critical issues that affected the sport industry generally or African-American athletes specifically.

The black sports reporter, on the other hand, represented a more sensitive, socially conscious journalist. Interestingly enough, race did not determine who these black sports reporters were. Robert Lipsyte of the *New York Times* and Pete Axthelm of *Newsweek* fell in this category. They did not write exclusively about events that occurred on the field but also focused on issues that might have affected athletes off the field. Black sports reporters did not concern themselves with how the sports establishment responded to their stories. However, they did believe in all the principles and ethical considerations that sports supposedly foster. Their fight was against those who violated these standards and sought to profit from their debasement.

Beginning in chapter three, Edwards highlights the forces that led to mounting the black athlete revolt, culminating into the Olympic Project for Human Rights (OPHR). He argued that the black athlete revolt, as a phase of the black liberation movement, was as legitimate as the sit-ins, the freedom rides, or any other demonstrations of African-American efforts to gain freedom. Its goals were the same as those of any other genuine aspect of the movement—equality, justice, regaining lost black dignity during three hundred years of slavery, and attaining basic human and civil rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the concept of American democracy. With the struggles being waged in other areas of U.S. society—like education, housing, and employment—it was only a matter of time before African-American athletes would assert their manhood and come to grips with the facts of their existence. Moreover, the revolt of the black athlete had its roots and drew its momentum from black peoples' resistance in the distant past of brutal oppression and callous exploitation. In the late 1960s, lynching, murders, and beatings served only to heighten the resistance, providing the movement with a new force and direction.¹³

The fundamental underpinning of the OPHR was that, through a collective response on the part of black athletes throughout America, international attention would ideally focus on their plight to show that all was not well in the sports world. In this way the OPHR epitomized Malcolm X's assertion for the need for black unity and self-determination of the black struggle that became more fully developed and institutionalized in the Black Power era. Instilled with cultural pride and historical wisdom, black athletes would, with a new confidence, begin to chart their own course in the sports world.¹⁴

The proposed boycott of the 1968 Olympic Games spurred a debate over the value of sport as a disseminator of virtue and goodwill. Tommie Smith argued that if sports, the Olympics in particular, were influential in creating goodwill among the races then as the number of blacks participating in the games increased there should also be a commensurate rise in racial harmony in the U.S. Smith and others recognized that such was not the case, and this provided him with a rationale for the boycott by suggesting that blacks should withdraw from the sport entirely to decrease tension among the races. Conversely, former Olympic medallist Rafer Johnson stated that participation in the games was an individual matter, and if someone wanted to withdraw that was their business. Johnson could not fathom a group withdrawal regardless of what they were protesting about. He added that a boycott would not bring better housing for blacks, nor assure their acceptance in society, nor increase understanding between the races.

Moreover, Johnson argued that sport was the great equalizer and blacks, along with everyone else, "should be proud to participate in the games and to give 100 percent of themselves for team and country."¹⁵

Edwards countered Johnson's argument by pointing out that neither a Nobel Prize nor an Olympic medal elevated an African American to human status in the U.S. Muhammad Ali, for example, was denied service in a restaurant in his hometown of Louisville, Kentucky, after winning the gold medal in the 1964 Olympic Games. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a Nobel Prize winner, was violently gunned down in his own country. Edwards concluded that the only reason Johnson was not attacked was that he had not taken a stand in support of the liberation for black people.

The final part of the book dealt with the OPHR's attempt to achieve its goals and linked its efforts to the overall struggle for human rights in U.S. society. First, it boycotted events sanctioned by the New York Athletic Club (NYAC) and any athletic meets with South Africa and Rhodesia as participants. The NYAC was chosen because of its exclusion of blacks and Jews from membership. The African countries were targeted due to their treatment of black citizens. When the International Olympic Committee (IOC) announced that South Africa would participate in the Mexico City games, the OPHR mobilized to pressure the IOC to reverse its decision. Simultaneously, Edwards proposed to establish a second set of games that would preferably be held in an African nation. The OPHR would initiate a fund-raising drive to support and maintain all athletes who qualified to participate in these African games. Yet external pressure brought on by the OPHR and various groups resulted in the IOC reversing its decision.¹⁶

The effectiveness of the NYAC boycott and the IOC's reversal had been translated into effective group action. Many athletes, however, were uncertain regarding their roles within the broader political spectrum. Debates regarding the kinds of protest gestures the athletes would stage remained unresolved. Several athletes began to have second thoughts about the boycott. It was problematic for the OPHR to maintain solidarity within the midst of this uncertainty.

The main theme of Edwards' narrative was to explain how the revolt of the black athlete was rooted in the same soil that ignited the Civil Rights and Black Power movements. It faced the same dilemmas and reflected the same quest for African-American freedom. His work was the first book on this theme based on primary research. It was also an insider's view of the revolt and the first to provide a critical perspective regarding the black sporting experience in the predominantly white sport industry. He corrected the tacit assumption that blacks were grateful to compete in the white collegiate and professional sports world. While there is much to praise in Edwards' work, he could have made his discussion stronger by more directly comparing the revolt with the overall black liberation struggle in areas like housing, employment, and educational opportunities. A reader today would find the book dated in its organization, lacking definitive evidence to validate his perspective, and having no theoretical construct. The internal struggle in Mexico City involving the students and the government that could have disrupted the games did not play a big role in the analysis. The African nation's efforts to pressure the IOC to reverse its decision regarding South Africa received minimal

attention. Contemporary readers would also look for more discussion of such topics as the debate on whether to boycott or not among the African-American athletes, the relationship between the OPHR and civil rights leaders—like Martin Luther King—and Black Power activists, like H. Rap Brown.

In the 1980s, scholars began to reassess the black athlete revolt. Their works can be summarized as follows. By the late 1960s, African-American athletes began to shed their traditional conservative approach to racial matters. They spearheaded an "athletic revolution" by challenging the racial discrimination that existed in athletic departments in various colleges across the country and professional sport organizations. Whereas their activism did not reach the degree evident among some members of their community, black athletes in unprecedented numbers became proactive in the civil rights struggle. They wrestled with the conflicting role demands of being athletes and black Americans by continuing to distinguish themselves in sport and simultaneously join with others in the black community to denounce everything from the lack of black executives in professional sports to racial exploitation in college athletics. The intensity of racial disturbances by black athletes reached its peak in 1968 after several years of growing frustration. It quickly dissipated under the strain of new civil rights legislation and the reconciliation of many Americans to the idea of integration.¹⁷

Currently, Amy Bass has provided the most definitive account of the black athlete revolt and the plethora of events that led up to the 1968 Olympic Games. The emergence of the Olympic Project for Human Rights, the construction of the Olympic Village in a "developing country," and the political uprisings of youth served to cast a shadow over the Olympics in Mexico. One of the most insightful issues Bass explores deals with what she called the "creation of a black athlete collective that had emerged from an organic political interest in racial formation rather than from the scientific classification or conventional social stratification conventionally maintained in U.S. society." By the spring of 1968, a significant change occurred as the focus moved from individuals marginalized as militant—like Muhammad Ali—to a collective political force. The effectiveness of the NYAC boycott and the IOC's reversal had been translated into effective group action. However, it was unclear to many athletes what their role was within the broader political collective. By the time of the Olympic trials, debates regarding the best way to present a united political posture remained unresolved. Should the athletes boycott or not? Forces both internal and external to the OPHR made it problematic to maintain solidarity. A fundamental obstacle to unity, Bass argues, was the lack of any kind of input from prominent black female athletes. Concerns for their quest for human rights were either marginalized or ignored.¹⁸

Harry Edwards' scholarship made a significant contribution. He created the essential narrative for the history of the African-American experience in sport during the Black Power era. Much like Harold Seymour's contribution to baseball history, Edwards established a high standard for research and analysis throughout his narrative and paved the way to intellectual respectability for the sport history and sport sociology fields.



¹⁷Harry Edwards, *The Revolt of the Black Athlete* (New York: The Free Press, 1969); Bob Teague, book review, "The Revolt of the Black Athlete," *New York Times*, 5 October 1969, pp. 10, 12. Amy Bass has

recently written a definitive account on the African-American protest of the 1968 Olympic Games. See *Not the Triumph but the Struggle: The 1968 Olympics and the Making of the Black Athlete* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002). Edwards also deals with the black athlete revolt in "The Olympic Project For Human Rights: An Assessment Ten Years Later," *Black Scholar* 6 (1979): 2-8; idem, "Reflections on Olympic Sportpolitics: History and Prospects, 1968-1984," *The Crisis* 90 (1983): 20-24; idem, *The Struggle That Must Be: An Autobiography* (New York: Macmillan, 1980); idem, "The Black Athletes 20th Century Gladiators For White America," in *Sport Sociology: Contemporary Themes*, eds. Andrew Yiannakis, Thomas D. McIntyre, Merrill J. Melnick and Dale P. Hart (Dubuque, Iowa.: Kendall/Hart Publishing, 1976), 167-172; idem, *Sport Sociology* (New York: Macmillan., 1972). Edwards also dealt with black student uprisings on college campuses in *Black Students* (New York: The Free Press, 1970); William H. Friedland and Harry Edwards, "Confrontation at Cornell," in *The Transformation of Activism*, ed. August Meier (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1970), 69-89. Edwin B. Henderson, *The Negro in Sports* (Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers., 1939); idem, with the editors of *Sport Magazine, The Black Athlete: Emergence and Arrival* (Cornwall Heights, Penn.: Pennsylvania Publishers., 1968); Andrew S. Young, *Negro Firsts In Sports* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing, 1963).

²Edwards quote on Schmeling in Bass, *Not the Triumph*, 82; Edwards' early attitude on sports in Edwards, *The Struggle*, 70-71. Scholarly works dealing with Black Power activists include Stokley Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967); Meier, ed., *The Transformation*; James Forman, *The Making of Black Revolutionaries* (New York: McMillan, 1972); Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981); Cheryl Greenberg, ed., *A Circle of Trust: Remembering SNCC* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1998). Edwards conducted a sociological study of the black activists of the late 1960s. See *Black Students*.

³Edwards, *The Struggle*, 139. For a definitive account regarding the link between Black Power activists and Malcolm X, see William L. Van Deburg, *New Day In Babylon: The Black Power Movement and American Culture, 1965-1975* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 11-28.

⁴Bill Russell and William McSweeney, *Go Up For Glory* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1966); Johnny Sample, Fred J. Hamilton, and Sonny Schwartz, *Confessions of a Dirty Ballplayer* (New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc., 1970); Curt Flood and Richard Carter, *The Way It Is* (New York: Trident Press, 1970). See also Jim Brown and Myron Cope, *Off My Chest* (Garden City, N. Y. : Doubleday & Co., 1964). Several white athletes also provided a critical critique of the team sports industry. See Dave Meggyesy, *Out Of Their League* (New York: Coronet Communications, Inc., 1971); Chip Oliver, *High for the Game* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1971); Bernie Parrish, *They Call It A Game* (New York: The Dial Press, 1971); Gary Shaw, *Meat on the Hoof* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972). Robert Weisbrot highlights Robinson crossing the color line and provides a brief account on the early disillusionment regarding the process of integration among black athletes in *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1990), 11, 223. In his revised version, Steven F. Lawson alludes to Robinson crossing the color line in *Running For Freedom: Civil Rights and Black Politics in America Since 1941*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1997), 97-98. Towards the end of his life, Jackie Robinson also expressed this sense of disillusionment. See *I Never Had It Made* (New York: Ecco Press, 1995).

⁵Edwards, *Revolt*, xxix. Manning Marable, *Race, Reform, and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction In Black America, 1945-1982* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1984); Weisbrot, *Freedom Bound*; Harvard Sitkoff, *The Struggle For Black Equality 1954-1982*, rev. ed., (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993); John Dittmar, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

⁶Edwards, *Revolt*, 7.

⁷Ibid., 8.

⁸Ibid., 12. Jack Scott's investigative reporting on the experience of black athletes twenty years after Jackie Robinson crossing the color line reinforces Edwards' perspective. See Jack Scott, *The Athletic Revolution* (New York: The Free Press, 1971).

⁹Similar sentiments regarding interracial dating were also expressed in Jack Olsen's series of articles in *Sport Illustrated's* investigation of the plight of the black athlete in the 1960s. See "Pride and Prejudice," *Sports Illustrated*, 8 July 1968, pp. 18-42.

¹⁰By the 1970s and 1980s, several sociologists examined the phenomena of stacking. See, for example, John W. Loy and Joseph McElvogue, "Racial Segregation in American Sport," *International Review of Sport Sociology* 5 (1970): 5-24; D. Stanley Eitzen and David C. Sanborn, "The Segregation of Blacks by Playing Position in Football: Accident or Design," *Social Science Quarterly* 55 (1975): 948-959; Joseph Dougherty, "Race and Sport: A Follow Up Study," *Sport Sociology Bulletin* 5 (1976): 1-12; Donna R. Madison and Daniel M. Landers, "Racial Discrimination in Football: A Test of the 'Stacking' of Playing Positions Hypothesis," in *Social Problems in Athletics: Essays in the Sociology of Sport*, ed. Daniel M. Landers (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), 151-156; John D. Massengale and Steven R. Farrington, "The Influence of Playing Position Centrality on the Careers of College Football Coaches," *Review of Sport and Leisure* 2 (1977): 107-115; Jomills Henry Braddock II, "Race and Leadership in Professional Sports: A Study of Institutional Discrimination in the National Football League," *Arena Review* 5 (1981): 16-25; Clarence Eugene Burns, "Position Occupancy Patterns as a Function of Race: The National Football League Draft 1968 to 1983" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of California-Santa Barbara, 1988).

¹¹Edwards, *Revolt*, 20.

¹²*Ibid.*, 28.

¹³See, for example, Robert Self, "'TO PLAN OUR LIBERATION': Black Power and the Politics of Place in Oakland, California, 1965-1977," *Journal of Urban History* 26 (2000): 759-792; Timothy Tyson, "Robert F. Williams 'Black Power' and the Roots of the African American Freedom Struggle," *Journal of American History* 85 (1998): 540-570.

¹⁴For an account regarding the institutional development of the Black Power movement and the ideology that governed it, see Van Deburg, *New Day*, 11-28. See also John T. McCartney, *Black Power Ideologies: An Essay in African-American Political Thought* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992).

¹⁵Edwards, *Revolt*, 62.

¹⁶For an account linking Black Power to international politics, see Yohuru R. Williams, "American Exported Black Nationalism: The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Black Panther Party, and the Worldwide Freedom Struggle, 1967-1972," *Negro History Bulletin* 60 (1997): 13-20. Mary L. Dudziak examines the link between civil rights and international politics in *Cold Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

¹⁷Scholars have begun to examine the forces that led to the growing frustrations among African-American athletes prior to 1968. See Charles K. Ross, *Outside the Lines: African Americans and the Integration of the National Football League* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); Thomas G. Smith, "Civil Rights on the Gridiron: The Kennedy Administration and the Washington Redskins," *Journal of Sport History* 14 (1987): 189-208; Jack E. Davis, "Baseball's Reluctant Challenge: Desegregating Major League Spring Training Sites, 1961-1964," *Journal of Sport History* 19 (1992): 144-162; Jeffrey Sammons, *Beyond The Ring: The Role of Boxing in American Society* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985); Charles H. Martin, "Integrating New Year's Day: The Racial Politics of College Bowl Games in the American South," *Journal of Sport History* 24 (1997): 358-377; Maureen Smith, "New Orleans, New Football League, and New Attitudes: The American Football League All-Star Game Boycott, January 1965," in *Race and Sports in America: Providing Fresh Perspectives, Raising New Questions*, ed. Michael E. Lomax (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, forthcoming). Scholars examining the black athlete revolt include: William J. Baker, *Sports in the Western World* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1982), 243-252; Donald Spivey, "The Black Athlete in Big-Time Intercollegiate Sports, 1941-1968," *Phylon* 44 (1983): 116-125; idem, "Black Consciousness and the Olympic Protest Movement, 1964-1980," in *Sport in America: New Historical Perspectives*, ed. Donald Spivey (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985), 239-262; Randy Roberts and James S. Olson, *Winning Is the Only Thing: Sports in America since 1945* (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 25-46, 163-188; David K. Wiggins, "'The Year of Awakening': Black Athletes, Racial Unrest and the Civil Rights Movement of

1968," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 9 (1992): 188-208; idem, *Glory Bound: Black Athletes in a White America* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1997); John Sayle Watterson, *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy* (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), esp. Chapter 16.

¹⁸Bass, *Not the Triumph*, 186. I provide a more definitive review of Bass's work in the *Journal of African American Studies* (forthcoming).